DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 798 CS 505 313

AUTHOR Greenberg, Karen
TITLE The Issue of Teaching Ethics in the Introductory Speech Course.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (77th, Atlantic City, NJ, April 30-May 3, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Ethical Instruction; *Ethics; Higher Education; *Introductory Courses; *Speech Communication; *Speech Curriculum; Speech Instruction; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Speech Departments

ABSTRACT

An introductory speech communication course should contain a unit on communication ethics so that students learn ethical standards and how they should be applied in creating and delivering a message or responding to a message. One of the many hinderances that accompany incorporating such a unit into the curriculum is the lack of precedence for doing so. In teaching a unit on communication ethics, it may be best to consider that there is no single "right" way to teach ethics, but many good ways. One successful example of application is based on the learning objective that students should be able to formulate in their own words how a communicator can and ought to take responsibility for the means and ends of his or her communication. A three-page bibliography is appended. (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED271798

THE ISSUE OF TEACHING ETHICS IN THE INTRODUCTORY SPEECH COURSE

Karen Greenberg

University of Massachusetts at Amherst

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Eastern Communication Association

Atlantic City, New Jersey

April 30-May 3 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Karen Greenberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 505 313

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I. Pedagogical Power

> There must be a dialogue relationship between content and craft [in teaching], or both are impoverished. Without that interaction, the craftsman is all manner and nonsubstance, and the visionary is a bore.
>
> Teaching as an art involves another dialogue as well, the dialogue between the student and the teacher. The two dialogues overlap as they go on. . . .[1]

Teachers, especially we who teach the introductory speech course, need to continue to develop dialogues with ourselves and with our students; we need to continue to talk about how our communication shapes classroom realities. Specifically, we need to continue to examine how we view and how we teach communication ethics. "[O]ur ethical responsibilities [to our students] stem from a status or position we have earned or have been granted. . . ."[2] Because we, as speech teachers, value improving the quality of classroom dialogue and because our students value the same, but are socially impotent to affect classroom dynamics, we are responsible for instigating any necessary changes.

In classroom communication situations, the participants are of known unequal social status and communication responsibility. Our legitimized reality creating power is more weighty and is less often questioned than the legitimized reality creating power of our students. As Emily Hancock points out in "Lesson in Learning," "[t]he student who enrolls in an academic program is placed in a subordinate position."[3]

Although some students seek access to nontraditional communication roles, unless these alternative roles are

---

1. Paul A. Lacey, "Teaching as a Double Dialogue," Learning About Teaching, Ed. John F. Noonan, New Directions for Teaching and Learning Series, 4(Washington D.C: Jossey-Bass, 1980) 76, 80.

2. Richard L. Johannesen, Ethics in Human Communication, 2nd ed. (Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland, 1975) 6.

3. Emily Hancock, "Lesson in Learning," Learning About Teaching, 69.

eventually legitimized by us and by other students, these students cannot succeed at changing their roles.[4] We are the ones in the classroom responsible for monitoring the classroom dialogue.

Further, whereas in most kinds of classes students sense that they are limited participants in the communication that shapes their reality, in speech classes, by virtue of the subject, students are expected to know about their limited roles.

> As students come to realize that all communication influences others, whether for good or for evil, they begin to rethink the impact their daily discourse has on attitudes, feelings and behaviors of others.[5]

In other words, as students learn more about the speech process, they learn more about the definitions of their roles within it. Speech students are enabled by their lessons to see how, communication of knowledge " . . . functions as a double repression: in terms of those it excludes from the process and in terms of the model and the standard(the bars) it imposes on those receiving this knowledge."[6] These students are enabled to see the limitations of classroom dialogue.

4.

> The objectivated meanings of institutional activity are conceived of as "knowledge" and transmitted as such. Some of this "knowledge" is deemed relevant to all, some only to certain types. That is, some types are designated as transmitters, other types as recipients . . . . . All transmissions of institutional meanings obviously implies control and legitimation procedures.

Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality (New York: Doubleday, 1966) 70-71.

5. Hazel J. Rozema, "Can We as Communication Scholars Teach Ethics without Preaching Values?" Speech Communication Association Convention, Nov. 1982. 2-3.

6. Michael Foucault, Language, Counter-Memory, Practice, Trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherrry Simon, Ed. Donald F. Bouchard (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1977) 219.

We can help our students overcome these limitations. One change we can instigate is to include a unit on communication ethics, so that "student[s] learn what standards are, and [apply] those standards in creating and delivering a message or responding to a message." [7]

II. Becoming Accountable

Teaching communication ethics is easier said than done. One problem with incorporating a communication ethics unit into the introductory course is our lack of awareness or willingness to do so. There are several reasons why, despite our understanding of the nature of our discourse's reality shaping and communication modeling power, we may be unwilling to take responsibility for it. We may consider such actions "unpopular" because we accept the notion of "a teaching machine," which emphasizes quantitatively, rather than qualitatively, rigorous education. Perhaps we fear students' dissonance. We may consider such actions "too bothersome," too, because we may see them as creating needs for: additional self-examination, learning new philosophical concepts, and taking new responsibilities. [8] "[T]he sense-making procedures made available to us by the social order (or orders) into which we have been socialized. . . [are] constitutive of people's social being in a very deep way." [9] This depth often presents problems.

Another problem with incorporating a communication ethics unit into the introductory speech course may be the lack of precedence. Consider the communication discipline's record, both in terms of practice and theory, on teaching communication ethics

---

7. James R. Andrews, The Practice of Rhetorical Criticism (New York: Macmillan, 1983) 13.

8. Karen Greenberg, "Questioning the Lack of Accounting for the Power of Pedagogical Discourse," ms, May 1985. 7-8.

9. John Shotter, Social Accountability & Selfhood (London: Basil Blackwell, 1984) 171.

in the introductory speech course. We do not consider as a top priority allocating teaching time to communication ethics nor have we until recently relegitimized scholarship in it. Part of James W. Gibson et al's. study, "The Basic Speech Course at U.S. Colleges and Universities: IV," illuminates the lack of priority given to communication ethics as a topic in the introductory speech course. Gibson et al. explain that;

> [p]erhaps the most surprising finding is what <u>is not</u> ranked among the top ten topics in time spent in instruction. The absence of ethics and rhetorical criticism from the "top ten" . . . appears unusual . . . . [T]he apparent relatively small amount of time spent on ethics. . . provide interesting, if not puzzling, questions about instructional priorities.[10]

J. Michael Sproule, too, suggests in "Whose Ethics in the Classroom? On the Politics of Ethics," that communication ethics has an uncertain place in the classroom;

> The place of ethics in today's classrooms can be only described as ambiguous. . . .While the upheavals of the '60s and '70s created a renewed acceptability for searching inquiries into the nature of modern society, the politics of recent years has seen the anti-critical trends continue. . . .[11]

Also on record is our recent interest in forums for the discussion of communication ethics and in research on

---

10. James W. Gibson, Michael S. Hanna, and Bill M. Huddleston, "The Basic Speech Course at U.S. Colleges and Universities: IV," <u>Communication Education</u> 34(1985): 286-287. J. Vernon Jensen, however, makes the counterclaim in "Teaching Ethics in Speech Communication," that "the last fifteen years have seen a gradually increasing interest in putting ethics in speech communication higher on the profession's priority scale." Jensen goes on to show how and where in curriculum, archives, conventions, conferences, textbooks, and books, this change is evidenced. J. Vernon Jensen, "Teaching Ethics in Speech Communication," <u>Communication Education</u> 34(1985): 324-325.

11. J. Michael Sproule, "Whose Ethics in the Classroom? On the Politics of Ethics," Speech Communication Association Convention, Nov. 1986. 9-10.

communication ethics. For instance, the Speech Communication Association's "proposed Communication Ethics Commission was officially established by the SCA Legislative Council at the 1984 SCA Convention in Chicago."[12] Although not as easily documentable, communication ethics research networks expanded at about this time, too. Both our general reluctance to change our classroom behavior and our late attention to the issue of communication ethics theory and research are reasons why communication ethics has received little notice in the introductory speech course. However, we can alter this status quo by deciding to include a unit on communication ethics in the introductory speech course.

III. Possible Modes

If we decide to teach communication ethics, we ought not merely prescribe a set of norms for our students to follow.[13] Rather it might be useful for us to act as if there is no single "right" way of teaching ethics in the introductory speech course, but many good ways.

---

12. SCA Communication Ethics Commission Newsletter. 1.1 Sept. 1985, 1. Certainly, "[s]uch a research topic is not likely to ever be closed to needed investigation. Communication ethics is a perennial concern for our discipline . . . ." Ronald C. Arnett, "The Status of Ethics Scholarship in Speech Communication Journals from 1915 to 1985," Speech Communication Association Convention, Denver, Nov. 1985. 28-29.

13. however we choose to teach ethics cannot help but be influenced by our personal metaethics.

> It might be argued that so to deny an entailment between normative ethical statements and metaethical statements is to presuppose a number of metaethical theses that are themselves quite questionable: that one cannot derive an "ought" from an "is," that there is a clearly demarcated line between factual statements and normative statements or between descriptive discourse and prescriptive and evaluative.

Kai Nielsen. "Ethics, Problems of," The Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 1967 ed., 120.

Some good ways to teach communication ethics into the introductory speech course can be found in the literature. Other successful approaches can come from our own knowledge and experience. Let us look at examples of both.

Hazel J. Rozema and J. Vernon Jensen, among others, have proposed systems for teaching communication ethics to introductory speech students. In "Can We as Communication Scholars Teach Ethics without Preaching Values," Hazel J. Rozema suggests many possible ways in which one can teach communication ethics. Rozema's suggestions range from ignoring values questions to constantly raising them.[14] Alternatively, J. Vernon Jensen, in "Teaching Ethics in Speech Communication," suggests contexts for discussing ethics, focuses for discussions of ethics, and so on.[15] There are a variety of means provided in our literature for teaching communication ethics to introductory speech students.[16] I have referred to just a few. Perhaps our focus should be on the teaching of communication ethics rather than on the finesse used in this instruction. Finesse aside, we can look to our own knowledge and experience for ideas on how to incorporate this unit.

IV. One Example of Application

When I have incorporated an unit on communication ethics into my introductory speech course, I have set the following learning

---

14. Hazel J. Rozema. "Can We as Communication Scholars Teach Ethics without Preaching Values?" 5-7.

15. J. Vernon Jensen, "Teaching Ethics in Speech Communication," 326-329.

16. Other approaches include rhetorical criticism is suggested as a possible means to teach communication ethics, by Anthony Hillbruner in "The Moral Imperative of Criticism," Southern Speech Communication Journal 40(1975): 228. Dialectic, too, is described as a possible means, by Paul A. Fritz and Richard L. Weaver II in "Teaching Critical Thinking Skills in the Public Speaking Course:: A Liberal Arts Perspective," SCA Convention, Chicago, Oct. 1984. 22.

objective; my students should be able to formulate in their own words how a communicator can and ought take responsibility for the means and ends of his or her communication. I have found combinations of several methods useful.

To begin with, I have tried to time the unit so that I have taught it after students have had instruction on both listening and persuasion principles. By then, students have hopefully become familiar with ideas like "communication is neither source nor recipient centered," and "communication power comes in a variety of forms."

I have also tried to work through a coordinated sequence of preassessment, instruction, and evaluation activities. During preassessment I have asked students to describe: the "responsible" communicator, the importance of an audience's role in communication, and the nature of "ethics." My approaches have ranged from an informal class discussion on two seemingly ethically polar speakers (e.g. Kennedy and Hitler) to a formalized questionnaire on students' knowledge of metaethics.

After preassessing my students' knowledge of ethics, I have provided them with information on the topic. I have brought to class or assigned for homework, articles, books, and tapes, as appropriate, on normative communication ethics and on general metaethics. I have used Andersen's and Jeffrey's Speech Communication Association presidential addresses to illustrate normative ethics.[17] I have used "Thinking and Speaking About Values: Consequences" in Thinking and Speaking, "An Ethical Orientation" in Thomas R. Nilsen's Ethics of Speech Communication, and "Morality and Moral Philosophy" in William K.

---

17. Kenneth E. Andersen, "A Code of Ethics for Speech Communication," Speech Communication Association presidential address, Speech Communication Association Convention, 11 Nov. 1983. Robert C. Jeffrey, "The Ethics of Public Discourse," Speech Communication Association presidential address, Speech Communication Association Convention, 11 Nov. 1973.

Frankena's Ethics.[18] to illustrate metaethics. I have also used Christians G. Clifford et al's "Honesty and Deception: Business, Professional and Media Ethics," Frederick Shauer's Free Speech: A Philosophical Enquiry, and Richard L. Johannesen's Ethics in Communication as supplementary material.[19]

Concurrent with reading the above sources, my students have been asked to take part in related assignments. They have been required to complete study guides, which consisted of questions that outlined assigned readings and required students to think critically about the contents of the readings. Students have been asked to conduct teacher-inclusive discussions, which focused on study guides or on supplementary questions and featured student discussion leaders. I have also required students to conduct teacher-exclusive discussions, which used questions similar to those used in teacher-inclusive discussions, but allowed students the latitude of freedom that is part of teacherless talks. Finally, paper writing required students to develop their own set of normative communication ethics which included prescriptions for the responsibilities of the audience

---

18. Otis T. Walter and Robert L. Scott, "Thinking and Speaking About Values: Consequences," Thinking and Speaking: A Guide to Intelligent Oral Communication, 5th ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1984) 223-244. Thomas R. Nilsen, "An Ethical Orientation," Ethics of Speech Communication. Bobbs Merrill Series in Speech Communication (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966) 1-15. William K. Frankena, "Morality and Moral Philosophy," Ethics, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973) 2-11.

19. Christians G. Clifford et al. "Honesty and Deception: Business, Professional and Media Ethics," A Short Course, Speech Communication Association Convention, Denver, 7 Nov. 1985. Frederick Shauer, Free Speech: A Philosophical Enquiry (New York: Cambridge UP, 1982). Richard L. Johannesen, Ethics in Communication. See also Richard L. Johannesen, Ethical Responsibility in Communication: A Selected, Annotated Bibliography, 4th ed. Speech Communication Association, 1984.

and the speaker or writer.[20]

After my students completed the instructional portion of the communication ethics unit, I evaluated their knowledge. Evaluations have involved sharing parts of or the entire contents of some of their ethics papers in specific class discussions; giving quizzes; measuring the quality and quantity of general class discussions, peer evaluations, and student input during student-teacher conferences; and highlighting the application of metaethical questions to later speech assignments and class topics.

Although the combinations of the above methods varied from semester to semester, both my students and I usually have felt that the unit was invaluable. Typically, my students and I have also come away from the unit with a feeling of improved classroom dialogue.

Instructors can draw on their own knowledge and experience as well as the knowledge and experience of others, for suggestions on how to incorporate a unit on communication ethics into the introductory speech course. Regardless of where we get our methods, or why we are motivated to use them, we should instigate the incorporation of an ethics unit into this course! As Charles Sears Baldwin claimed,

> [t]he theory or rhetoric has always concerned so many more people than the theory of any other art as to be part of every pedagogy. Here the practise [sic] of education not only may be guided by philosophy; it must be. For any coherence in its teaching, rhetoric must be comprehended not only in its immediate functions, but in its pervasive relations to other studies. It is at once the constant in educational schemes and the art among sciences. How we are in a given time or place to

---

20. This assignment uses Deni Elliott's second definition of "standard;" "perceived characteristics of the ideal practitioner that may or may not be realistically attainable," as defined in "A Conceptual Analysis of the Purpose of Ethics Codes," Journal of Mass Media Ethics Prototype(1986): 15. See Appendix for examples of this assignment.

> learn or teach rhetoric depends on how we understand its function and scope in specific relations.[21]

In other words, if our students are to learn about the norms of the speech communication process, they must learn about the norms as the process exists holistically, and as the process exists specifically in the introductory speech communication classroom. It is vital for us to include a unit on communication ethics in our introductory speech course curriculum if this learning is to be complete.

---

21. Charles Sears Baldwin, Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic (Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith, 1959) 6.

Bibliography

Andersen, Kenneth E. "A Code of Ethics for Speech Communication". Speech Communication Association presidential address. Speech Communication Association Convention. 11 Nov. 1983.

Andrews, James R. The Practice of Rhetorical Criticism. New York: Macmillan, 1983.

Arnett, Ronald C. "The Status of Ethics Scholarship in Speech Communication Journals from 1915 to 1985." Speech Communication Convention. Denver. Nov. 1985.

Baldwin, Charles Sears. Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic. Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith, 1959.

Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann. The Social Construction of Reality. New York: Doubleday, 1966.

Boileau, Don M. Ed. "Development and Directions for the Basic Course: ERIC Report." Communication Education 34(1985): 74-80.

Clifford, Christians G. et al. "Honesty and Deception: Business, Professional and Media Ethics." A Short Course. Speech Communication Association Convention. Denver. 7 Nov. 1985.

Elliott, Deni. "A Conceptual Analysis of the Purpose of Ethics Codes." Journal of Mass Media Ethics Prototype(1986): 5-6.

Foucault, Michael. Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherrry Simon. Ed. Donald F. Bouchard. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1977.

Fritz, Paul A. and Richard L. Weaver II. "Teaching Critical Thinking Skills in the Public Speaking Course: A Liberal Arts Perspective." Speech Communication Association Convention. Chicago. Oct. 1984.

Frankena, William K. Ethics. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Gibson, James W. Michael S. Hanna, and Bill M. Huddleston. "The Basic Speech Course at U.S. Colleges and Universities:IV. Communication Education 34(1985): 281-291.

Greenberg, Karen. "Questioning the Lack of Accounting for the Power of Pedagogical Discourse." ms. May 1985.

Hancock, Emily. "Lesson in Learning." Learning About Teaching. Ed. John F. Noonan. New Directions for Teaching and Learning Series. 4. Washington D.C: Jossey-Bass, 1980. 63-70.

Hillbruner, Anthony. "The Moral Imperative of Criticism." Southern Speech Communication Journal 40(1975): 228-247.

Jeffrey, Robert C. "The Ethics of Public Discourse". Speech Communication Association presidential address. Speech Communication Association Convention. 11 Nov. 1973.

Jensen. J. Vernon. "Teaching Ethics in Speech Communication." Communication Education 34(1985): 324-330.

Johannesen, Richard L. Ethics in Communication. 2nd ed. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland, 1975.

----------. Ethical Responsibility in Communication: A Selected, Annotated Bibliography. 4th ed. Speech Communication Association. 1984.

Lacey, Paul A. "Teaching as Double Dialogue." Learning About Teaching. Ed. John F. Noonan. New Directions for Teaching and Learning Series. 4. Washington D.C: Jossey-Bass, 1980. 71-80.

Mazieka, Michael. "Ethics Report." ms. Nov. 1984.

Molaskey, Jim. "One Speaker's Code of Ethics." ms. Nov. 1984.

Nielsen, Kai. "Ethics, Problems of." The Encyclopedia of Philosophy. 1967 ed.

Nilsen, Thomas R. Ethics of Speech Communication. Bobbs Merrill Series in Speech Communication. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

Pearce, W. Barnett and Emil McGillahay. "Goodness and Beauty." ms. March 1986.

Robinson, George M, and Janice Moulton. Ethical Problems in Higher Education. Series Eds. Elizabeth Beardsley and John Atwel. Prentice-Hall Series in Occupational Ethics. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1985.

Rozema, Hazel J. "Can We as Communication Scholars Teach Ethics without Preaching Values?" Speech Communication Association Convention. Nov. 1982.

Speech Communication Association Communication Ethics Commission Newsletter. 1.1 Sept. 1985.

Shauer, Frederick. Free Speech: A Philosophical Enquiry. New York: Cambridge UP, 1982.

Shotter, John. Social Accountability & Selfhood. London: Basil Blackwell, 1984.

Sproule, J. Michael. "Whose Ethics in the Classroom? On the Politics of Ethics." Speech Communication Association Convention. Nov. 1985.

Walter, Otis T. and Robert L. Scott. Thinking and Speaking: A Guide to Intelligent Oral Communication. 5th ed. New York: Macmillan, 1984.

Appendix

Two Students' Papers on Communication Ethics.

The following papers were written by two of my students during the fall 1984 semester. [22]

One Speaker's Code of Ethics

A speaker's code of ethics is the individual rules and guidelines of the speaker as a speaker. These rules or guidelines are usually not written or clearly defined, but they are used consciously or unconsciously by all speakers.

The beginning of my code of ethics [states] that the speaker should be knowledgable about the subject that is being spoken [about]. I feel that when a speaker chooses to speak, whether it is at the spur of the moment or for a well prepared speech, [he or she] should be knowledgable. I feel that [the] speaker [has] an obligation to [his or her] audience to speak of facts or opinions that [he or she] feels are substantial ones. The speaker should not try to deceive the audience. [He or] she should try to inform the audience. This information can be an opinion that the speaker feels strongly about and wants to share with other people. This information can also be a well thought out and researched topic backed up with strong facts. The important thing is that the speaker feels that this material is substantial and may be informative to other people. [T]hen [the material] is[acceptable] to be spoken if the person so desires.

The second part of my code of ethics is that when a speaker is expressing an idea or opinion, [he or she] should just express it and not try to force it upon others. I believe that everyone is entitled to their own ideas and beliefs. People have the right to speak freely about their opinions and beliefs[,] but they do not have the right to try to dictate them to other people. A speaker may inform the audience about his or her feelings toward a subject, but when the speaker tries to force those feelings upon the audience, then I believe [the speaker is] going beyond [his or her] right as a free speaker.

The main reason a speaker is speaking is to inform people. Once [he or she has] expressed the information [he or she] wish[es] to express, [he or she] should let the audience decide if they want to accept this information or reject it. The speaker has to recognize that the audience is just as entitled to their beliefs as the speaker is entitled to speak. If the speaker can influence the audience's ideas, even in the slightest

---

22. Jim Molaskey, "One Speaker's Code of Ethics," ms, Nov. 1984. and Michael Mazieka, "Ethics Report," ms, Nov. 1984.

way, through unbiased communication, then the speaker has captured the essence of communication.

When a speaker is speaking, he or she should try to use proper diction. Speakers should avoid using diction that will distort the meaning of things. Using diction in this manner is almost as bias as lying to an audience. When a speaker distorts the meaning of something through the use of diction, it has the same overall effect as lying[; t]he true meaning of what is being said is hidden through the use of words. When a person lies, the truth is being hidden. When a speaker changes the meaning of something through improper use of diction, the true meaning is being hidden from the audience, so this [action] could almost be a roundabout way of lying to your audience. The different uses of diction are very powerful tools in speaking. When used properly, diction can enhance a speech greatly, but when used improperly, diction can be very distorting and detrimental to the speech and the speaker.

The last part of my code of ethics is that the speaker should respect the audience. The speaker should recognize that the audience is the recipient of his or her ideas, and in many cases the audience has little or no background on the topic that is being spoken [about]. For this reason, the audience trusts the speaker and is very receptive of his or her ideas. The speaker must recognize that the audience trusts [him or her] and believes what he or she is saying. For this reason, the speaker must respect [the listeners'] vulnerable position and treat the audience the same way he or she would wish to be treated if he or she were in the same position. The speaker should also [keep in mind] the demographics of the audience. The speaker should relate his or her topic to the audience in a way that is not prejudiced to persons' race, religion, age or sex. The speaker should respect these qualities [of an audience] and try to make the audience feel that [its members are] respected. Once the audience feels [it is] respected, it will listen more objectively and the overall process of communication will be more effective.

A speaker should have some type of code of ethics. This code of ethics should reflect his or her own personal values and beliefs. A code of ethics is not taught; it is learned. [A code of ethics] continues to grow and change with the speaker and society, and that is why it is probably the most important [characteristic] of an effective speaker.

Ethics Report

In the paragraphs that follow I will describe a code of ethics that is used as a guideline when communicating with an audience. The ethics that follow do not necessarily apply to everyone, although some of these thoughts may be [familiar to all.] These ethics are not [limited in use] exclusively for formal situations, but also apply to everyday life. The purpose of this paper is to allow the reader to better understand my code of ethics.

One quality that I possess when speaking is that I like to be knowledgable in the area in which I am speaking. This quality allows me to be confident and excited about my speech. The audience, in turn, can benefit [from my speech] because they see that I care and feel good, therefore they will be more apt to listen. This [feeling] coorients the speaker and the audience, which is the whole purpose of [giving] a speech. Without this knowledge of my subject, the audience will realize that I do not know what I am talking about and they will lose interest. An example of this [loss of interest might happen] if a doctor [gives] a speech on architectural drawing. The doctor is not the [most qualified] person in the world to speak on this area. The audience would see this [lack of credibility] and [would] be skeptical about whether much of the material [presented] is true. With knowledge in my subject ara, I will be able to coorient with my audience.

Another quality I possess is truthfulness when delivering information to [an] audience. I will [present information] in such a way that the information is correct to[the best of] my knowledge. If the audience feels you are being untruthful, they will be turned off. However, if you are telling the truth and are knowledgable about your subject, the audience will be eager to listen, not [merely to] hear what your are saying. It is unethical for a speaker to stand in front of an audience and deceive them about the subject matter at hand.

Another quality is integrity. When I stand in front of an audience relating information on my subject, I would like my audience to walk away with the feeling that what I said I said sincerely. I would also like an audience to walk away with the feeling that there was serious intent on my part for them to be informed and to learn something about my topic. This information that the audience retains is hopefully not misconstrued because this means that I am not an effective speaker. I do not believe the audience must agree with my viewpoints, but just that they should understand my meaning and see where I am coming from.

A fourth quality that I possess is effectiveness. This quality is very difficult to achieve sometimes due to the complicated [nature] of the speech material. This quality is what makes a professional speaker a good speaker. Without this quality the audience will be bored and disinterested, so, as a speaker you must work at becoming effective.

Another quality is that of thinking of your audience in a kind way and not being rude or insensitive [to it]. You must realize that even though you may oppose a subject, you have no right to verbally abuse the people who may be in favor of the subject. The audience has rights as well as you do and it is very unethical to put your listeners down if you have different beliefs [than them.] This rule applies to using racial slurs or to even referring to a group of people in a derogatory manner.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

These ethics that have been discussed are the guidelines for speaking for me. I try to follow these ideas as closely as possible and when they are followed, I feel that something worthwhile has been accomplished. The following of these ethics results in an attentive and informed audience.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE